



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,677	03/20/2006	Kazuteru Kohno	Q93937	4512
23373	7590	08/24/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHTRUE MION, PLLC			PEPITONE, MICHAEL F	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/572,677	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOHNO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL PEPITONE	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                        |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1448)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/20/06, 9/14/06, 10/10/08, 4/30/09</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____   |



**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The references lined through in the Information Disclosure Statement received on 3/20/06 were considered in the Information Disclosure Statement received on 9/14/06.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1 and 4-9: In claim 1, it is unclear if the text within the parentheses is included in the claim and further limits the subject matter of the claim, or whether it is an aside to the claim and is not further limiting. Accordingly, dependent claims 4-9 are indefinite. For the purpose of further examination, it is taken that the text within the parenthesis further limits the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –


Art Unit: 1796

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by


Hashidzume *et al.* (WO 2004/024820). Hashidzume *et al.* (US 2005/0089698) was used as the English translation of Hashidzume *et al.* (WO 2004/024820).

Regarding claim 1: Hashidzume *et al.* teaches a layered silicate cation exchanged with an organic cation (¶ 1, 11), wherein the organic cation is phthalimidedecamethylencimidazolium bromide:



(¶ 144-147);

or N-phthalimidedecamethylene-trioctylphosphonium bromide:



(¶ 159-161),

having a cation exchange rate of 65% (¶ 67, 161).

The Office realizes that all the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference. However, the reference teaches all of the claimed reagents and was prepared under similar conditions. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. a specific surface area of 2.5-100 m<sup>2</sup>/g, would inherently be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicants' position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence

Art Unit: 1796

would need to be presented to support applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties and effects with only the claimed ingredients.

Regarding claim 6: Hashidzume *et al.* teaches a 100:7 weight ratio (in terms of ash) of poly(ethylene-2,6-naphthalenedicarboxylate) and the layered silicate cation exchanged with an organic cation {N-phthalimidodecamethylene-trioctylphosphonium bromide} (¶ 162-163).

The Office realizes that all the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference. However, the reference teaches all of the claimed reagents and was prepared under similar conditions. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. an average number of layers of the layered silicate in the thermoplastic resin of 2-8 layers, would inherently be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicants' position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be presented to support applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties and effects with only the claimed ingredients.

Regarding claims 7-9: Hashidzume *et al.* teaches melt kneading the layered silicate with poly(ethylene-2,6-naphthalenedicarboxylate) in a twin screw extruder with subsequent film formation of the resin (¶ 162-163).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1796

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashidzume *et al.* (WO 2004/024820) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Miyanaga *et al.* (US 5,879,589).

Regarding claims 4-5: Hashidzume *et al.* teaches the basic claimed composition [as set forth with respect to claim 1]; wherein an onium ion exchanged layered silicate is prepared, filtered, washed with water, and dried (¶ 161).

Hashidzume *et al.* does not teach freeze drying the onium ion exchanged layered silicate. However, Miyanaga *et al.* teaches a process for preparing an onium ion exchanged layered silicate, wherein the product was filtered, washed with water, and freeze dried (37:51-38:5). Hashidzume *et al.* and Miyanaga *et al.* are analogous art because they are concerned with a similar technical difficulty, namely the preparation of onium ion exchanged layered silicate. At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have combined freeze drying, as taught by Miyanaga *et al.* in the invention of Hashidzume *et al.*, and

would have been motivated to do so since Miyanaga *et al.* suggests that freeze drying is an effective way to dry onium ion exchanged layered silicates (37:63-38:1).

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 6, and 8-9 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 10-11 and 14-15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,189,782. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed layered silicate cation exchanged with an ammonium or phosphonium ion containing at least one imide group; thermoplastic {polyester} resin containing said onium ion exchanged layered silicate; and a film containing the thermoplastic resin and cation exchanged layered silicate substantially overlap in scope. The claimed cations of formulas I and 1 are obvious variants of each other.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure. See attached form PTO-892.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PEPITONE whose telephone number is (571)270-3299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MFP  
20-August-09

/Mark Eashoo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796